DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 933 CS 503 984

AUTHOR Bluman, Dale L.; Ward, Steven A.
TITLE The Development of a Student-Generated, Self-Anchoring Instrument for Assessing the Adaptation of Teacher Behaviors.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Chicago, IL, April 25-29,1978).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Higher Education; *Measures (Individuals); *Questionnaires; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; *Test Construction; Test Reliability

ABSTRACT

A student-generated, self-anchoring instrument should provide a teacher with more and different information than do conventional techniques. Such an instrument was developed by students in four sections of a basic course in speech communication. Students were asked to generate statements that described teacher behaviors adapted to their needs and expectations. A final list of 18 intuitively independent student-generated statements was developed, with each student statement being used to construct three items of the instrument. The first item asked the student to assess the importance of the teacher behavior to him or her. The second item asked the student to estimate how much of the time the student would prefer the teacher to act in the manner described. The third item asked the student to describe how much of the time the teacher did act in the manner described. A test of the instrument in 14 intact classroom units in a large university showed (1) the importance assigned individual teacher behaviors revealed no consistent overall pattern; (2) students across classes preferred teachers to enact three standard behaviors virtually all the time, yet students in different class situations attached differing amounts of importance to those standards; (3) correlations between the importance and the preferred frequency of teacher behaviors varied according to which behavior was rated; and (4) students observing the same teacher in a particular class tended to respond to questionnaire items regarding their observations in similar ways, suggesting evidence of the overall reliability of the questionnaire. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222933

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Development of a Student-Generated, Self-Anchoring Instrument for Assessing the Adaptation of Teacher Behaviors

Dale L. Bluman
Department of Speech and Theatre Arts
Shippensburg State College
Shippensburg, PA 17257
(717) 249-1411

and

Steven A. Ward
The Teacher Workshop Program
Department of Speech Communication
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-4692

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dale L. Bluman
Steven A. Ward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at
The 27th Annual Conference of
The International Communication Association
Division 7 - Instructional Communication
April 28, 1978

CS503984

The Development of a Student-Generated, Self-Anchoring Instrument for Assessing the Adaptation of Teacher Behaviors

In the contemporary educational literature, problems of effective teaching are often characterized as problems of effective communication.[1] Even though educators posit that communication which attempts to facilitate student learning is "intentionally influential,"[2] little attention has been given to developing a well-articulated theory of classroom communication as a type of rhetorical communication.[3] A rhetorical point of view should encourage teacher behavior which is:

1. Purposive - Teachers' actions should result from a decision-making process.
2. Adaptive - Teachers' decisions on what to say should be based on the teachers' analyses of the potential effects of the messages on the students.
3. Listener-Oriented - The effects of the teachers' messages rests in the students' perceptions of and reactions to the messages.

To act rhetorically, a teacher must pursue his/her goals by adapting to the needs or expectations of the particular students in his/her particular classroom. To assess the effects of his/her actions and to plan subsequent acts, the teacher should benefit from knowing the expectations of the students and the students' reactions to the teacher's behavior. The purpose of this paper is to describe the development of an instrument designed to assist teachers in assessing the impact of their behavior on their students.

In reviewing the literature, it is apparent that "rhetorical" student reaction instruments have not typically been used. For the almost fifty years that students have been rating their teachers using formal instruments, they have most often been called upon to evaluate teachers.[4] Although the validity of using student ratings has been criticized, Wise argues that

students are in the best position to evaluate teachers since students are the intended audience of teacher communication.[5] In the past ten years, most reports of research using students' ratings of teachers have concentrated on identifying students' perceptions of factors involved in effective teaching.[6] The research attempts to develop generalizable instruments useful to instructors and researchers in various courses of study through replication and cross-validation of factor-analytic techniques. Cronkhite[7] and McDowell and McDowell[8] have recently criticized this deductive approach, arguing that it overlooks the situational nature of communication.

For a teacher attempting to adopt a rhetorical approach to teaching, current instruments reflect inadequacies as feedback devices in two areas. First, the items of the instruments tend to be generated by teachers or to be gleaned by researchers from current educational theories. Thus, the items may or may not reflect what students view as important in the teaching transaction. Questionnaire items based upon student statements of the importance of various teacher behaviors should overcome this deficiency.

Second, the items on most instruments require students to rate teacher behaviors along a continuum from excellent to poor. The criteria by which students select their responses to these items is unclear. According to Torgerson, this is a characteristic of a "response scale": The variance in any one rating results from variance in both the subject and the stimulus being rated.[9] Constructing items which allow students to describe separately their expectations and their perceptions of how well their teachers fulfill those expectations should overcome this difficulty.

A student-generated, self-anchoring instrument ought to provide a teacher with more and different information than do conventional techniques. Such an

instrument was developed and research was undertaken to demonstrate its utility by investigating the following propositions:

1. There will be a relationship between students' situations and the relative importance assigned to various teacher behaviors.
2. There will be a relationship between students' situations and how much students prefer various teacher behaviors to be implemented.
3. Students will not respond the same way to questionnaire items assessing the importance and the preferred frequency of the same teacher behavior.

METHOD

Development of the Instrument

During the sixth week of fall term, 1976, students in four sections of a basic course in speech communication were asked to generate statements that described teacher behaviors which were adapted to their needs and expectations. The 91 students generated a total of 575 statements which reduced to 76 unique statements. These statements were examined and combined where they appeared to reflect similar student concerns. Statements which were not potentially applicable to all undergraduate courses or which could not be scaled along a time continuum were eliminated. A final list of 18 "intuitively independent" student-generated statements were used to construct the instrument.

Each student statement was used to construct three items on the instrument. The first item asks the student to assess the importance of the teacher behavior to him/her. The second item asks the student to estimate how much of the time the student would prefer the teacher to act in the manner described. The third item asks the student to describe how much of the time the teacher does act in the manner described. Thus the items ask the student to indicate the importance of the teacher behavior, his/her preference for the frequency of the behavior, and his/her observation of the frequency of the behavior. The 54 items were

arranged so that the 18 items indicating importance would come first, followed by the 36 items indicating the preferred and observed frequency. (See Appendix for a complete instrument.)

Implementation of the Instrument

Fourteen intact classroom units from a large Eastern university participated in the study. The classes were randomly selected from all undergraduate courses taught at the university. Student responses to the questionnaire were anonymous and optional. All of the data was collected during the tenth week of winter term, 1977.

Statistical Analyses

Proposition One was examined through a one-way analysis of variance. Following Labovitz, it was assumed that responses to the questionnaire items represented intervally-scaled data.[10] Thus, students' ratings of the importance of various teacher behaviors were utilized as the dependent variable, while membership in the different classes was utilized as the independent variable (student situation).

Proposition Two was analyzed in exactly the same manner, except that students' responses to questions assessing the preferred frequency of teacher behavior were utilized as the dependent variable.

Proposition Three was analyzed by computing Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination for students' responses to the related importance and preferred frequency questionnaire items.

Reliability was assessed through a one-way analysis of variance with students' reported observations of the frequency of teacher behaviors as the dependent variable, and class membership as the independent variable.

Following Rosenshine, it was assumed that there would be significantly less variation in students' observations of teachers' behaviors within classes than between classes.[11] Thus, significant findings of the analysis of variance were taken to be a rough indication of the reliability of the questionnaire.

RESULTS

As reported in Table 1, significant differences among classes were discovered regarding the relative importance students attached to 16 of the 18 questionnaire items. Only item 7, which asked students to indicate how important it was to them that instructors be willing to change the time spent on topics to ensure student uderstanding, and item 8, which asked students to rate the importance of teachers asking for suggestins on how to improve the class, failed to yield significant F-ratios.

Post hoc t-tests of differences between classes in their perceptions of the importance of various teacher behaviors revealed that a few classes were consistently higher or lower than other classes in their ratings of items. Other classes varied considerably in their ratings of the importance of different teacher behaviors. One class, for example, rated teachers' willingness to discuss students' special problems or interests and teachers' desires for students to see them as persons significantly lower than did most other classes. However, the same class rated teachers giving clear explanations and permitting students to disagree in class more important than did most other classes. This class was not significantly higher or lower than other classes in its ratings of the importance of the other 14 questionnaire items. Thus, post hoc analyses of the importance assigned individual teacher behaviors revealed no consistent overall pattern: Some classes regularly were higher or lower than other classes in their ratings,

TABLE 1

A COMPARISON OF IMPORTANCE ITEM SCORES AMONG CLASSES
THROUGH ANALYSES OF VARIANCE, ONE FACTOR
COMPLETELY RANDOMIZED DESIGN

Items	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
1 - Available outside class				
Among classes	13	35.999	2.769	3.100*
Within classes	305	272.415	0.893	
2 - Encourages discussion				
Among classes	13	38.265	2.944	4.218*
Within classes	305	212.826	0.698	
3 - Relates subject to student's life				
Among classes	13	22.920	1.763	2.024**
Within classes	305	265.689	0.871	
4 - Organized, prepared for class				
Among classes	13	13.942	1.073	2.783*
Within classes	305	117.526	0.385	
5 - Well informed about subject				
Among classes	13	6.727	0.517	2.130**
Within classes	305	74.090	0.243	
6 - Informative, interesting lectures				
Among classes	13	11.217	0.863	2.147**
Within classes	305	122.583	0.402	
7 - Willing to change time on topics				
Among classes	13	5.723	0.440	0.868 n.s.
Within classes	305	154.623	0.507	
8 - Asks for suggestions				
Among classes	13	10.247	0.789	1.145 n.s.
Within classes	305	209.986	0.689	

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

9 - Enthusiastic				
Among classes	13	18.309	1.408	2.929*
Within classes	305	146.676	0.481	
10 - Calls students by name				
Among classes	13	51.081	3.929	4.001*
Within classes	305	298.558	0.982	
11 - Talks about student problems				
Among classes	13	33.520	2.578	2.932*
Within classes	305	268.236	0.880	
12 - Gives clear, easy to understand explanations				
Among classes	13	14.737	1.134	3.089*
Within classes	305	111.181	0.367	
13 - Gives fair tests				
Among classes	13	45.339	3.488	7.458*
Within classes	304	142.159	0.468	
14 - Tells what is expected in class				
Among classes	13	12.521	0.963	2.194***
Within classes	304	133.433	0.439	
15 - Allows disagreement in class				
Among classes	13	27.921	2.148	3.945*
Within classes	305	166.067	0.545	
16 - Listens to questions, opinions				
Among classes	13	11.561	0.889	1.904****
Within classes	305	142.427	0.467	
17 - Wants to be seen as a person				
Among classes	13	36.100	2.777	3.119*
Within classes	305	271.518	0.890	
18 - Varies classroom activities				
Among classes	13	26.275	2.021	2.870*
Within classes	303	213.373	0.704	

*p=.001 **p<.02 ***p=.01 ****p<.05 n.s.not significant at p=.05

other classes varied from low to middle to high in their ratings of the importance of different teacher behaviors.

As reported in Table 2, significant differences among classes were discovered regarding the frequency that students preferred teachers to implement 13 of the 18 teacher behaviors. As was the case with the importance ratings, there were no significant differences among classes in their preferences for how often teachers should be willing to change the amount of time spent on topics or how often teachers should ask for suggestions for class improvement. Nor were there significant differences among classes in how often students preferred teachers to be organized and well prepared for class, to be well informed about the subject being taught, and to inform them what is expected in the class. These three behaviors emerged as "standard" expectations: Students across classes preferred teachers to enact these behaviors virtually all the time. Yet students in different class situations attached differing amounts of importance to these "standard" teacher behaviors.

As was the case with student importance ratings, post hoc t-tests revealed no consistent overall pattern among class preferences for the frequency of implementation of various teacher behaviors.

There was some relationship between students' assessments of the importance of teacher behaviors and how often they preferred those behaviors to occur (see Table 3). However, correlations between the importance and the preferred frequency of teacher behaviors varied according to which behavior was rated. In only one case did the coefficient of determination for the involved relationships exceed .5.

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF PREFERRED FREQUENCY ITEM SCORES AMONG CLASSES THROUGH ANALYSES OF VARIANCE, ONE FACTOR COMPLETELY RANDOMIZED DESIGN

Item	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
19 - Available outside class				
Among classes	13	15.465	1.190	1.827*
Within classes	304	197.910	0.651	
21 - Encourages discussion				
Among classes	13	26.044	2.003	2.702**
Within classes	303	224.644	0.741	
23 - Relates subject to student's life				
Among classes	13	23.628	1.818	2.309***
Within classes	302	237.739	0.787	
25 - Organized, prepared for class				
Among classes	13	6.266	0.482	1.732 n.s.
Within classes	303	84.293	0.278	
27 - Well informed about subject				
Among classes	13	2.602	0.200	1.094 n.s.
Within classes	302	55.238	0.183	
29 - Informative, interesting lectures				
Among classes	13	8.865	0.682	1.839*
Within classes	302	111.981	0.371	
31 - Willing to change time on topics				
Among classes	13	8.797	0.677	1.258 n.s.
Within classes	301	161.889	0.538	
33 - Asks for suggestions				
Among classes	13	16.306	1.254	1.658 n.s.
Within classes	302	228.463	0.757	

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

35 - Enthusiastic				
Among classes	13	11.700	0.900	2.167****
Within classes	303	125.809	0.415	
37 - Calls students by name				
Among classes	13	55.547	4.273	5.210**
Within classes	301	246.854	0.820	
39 - Talks about student problems				
Among classes	13	43.109	3.316	3.828**
Within classes	302	261.613	0.866	
41 - Gives clear, easy to understand explanations				
Among classes	13	8.099	0.623	1.831*
Within classes	302	102.762	0.340	
43 - Gives fair tests				
Among classes	13	9.797	0.754	2.870**
Within classes	300	78.766	0.263	
45 - Tells what is expected in class				
Among classes	13	5.277	0.406	1.231 n.s.
Within classes	302	99.625	0.330	
47 - Allows disagreement in class				
Among classes	13	29.773	2.290	3.039**
Within classes	302	227.554	0.754	
49 - Listens to questions, opinions				
Among classes	13	18.428	1.418	2.174****
Within classes	301	196.227	0.652	
51 - Wants to be seen as a person				
Among classes	13	43.927	3.379	3.796**
Within classes	298	265.253	0.890	
53 - Varies classroom activities				
Among classes	13	24.753	1.904	2.988**
Within classes	298	189.910	0.637	

*p<.05 **p=.001 ***p<.01 ****p<02 n.s.not significant at p=.05

TABLE 3

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN IMPORTANCE ITEM AND PREFERRED FREQUENCY ITEM SCORES

Importance and Preferred Frequency Items	Number of Pairs	Pearson Correlation Coefficients	Coefficients of Determination
Available outside class	318	.568	.323
Encourages discussion	317	.652	.425
Relates subject to student's life	316	.708	.501
Organized, prepared for class	317	.476	.227
Well informed about subject	316	.295	.087
Informative, interesting lectures	316	.345	.119
Willing to change time on topics	315	.425	.181
Asks for suggestions	316	.410	.168
Enthusiastic	317	.558	.311
Calls students by name	315	.637	.406
Talks about student problems	316	.613	.376
Gives clear, easy to understand explanations	314	.384	.147
Gives fair tests	314	.414	.171
Tells what is expected in class	315	.440	.194
Allows disagreement in class	316	.540	.292
Listens to questions, opinions	315	.449	.202
Wants to be seen as a person	312	.634	.402
Varies classroom activities	312	.533	.284

Reliability/Validity

As reported in Table 4, significant differences among classes were discovered at the .001 level for students' observations of all 18 of the teacher behaviors. This finding suggests that students observing the same teacher in a particular class tended to respond to questionnaire items regarding their observations in similar ways. Since the same teacher behaviors were used in similar question formats for the importance and preferred frequency sections of the questionnaire, this finding was taken as evidence of the overall reliability of the questionnaire.

The type of validity considered appropriate to the questionnaire was face validity, since face validity is concerned with the relevance of the instrument to the respondent.[12] Face validity was controlled for by developing questionnaire items from student-generated concerns and language.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the results reported above, it is clear that students' situations are associated with their perceptions of teachers' classroom behaviors. First, depending upon their situations, different students perceive different teacher behaviors as more or less important to them. Since student situation was defined in the study as membership in a particular class, variables operating to differentially influence students' perceptions of importance might include subject matter of the class, size of the class, the particular instructor involved, and backgrounds of class members (i.e., sex, age, major, term standing, experience in the subject matter, and overall academic proficiency).

Second, depending upon their situations, different students have different preferences for the frequency of implementation of various teacher behaviors. It should be noted that students' preferences for the frequency

TABLE 4

A COMPARISON OF OBSERVED FREQUENCY ITEM SCORES AMONG CLASSES THROUGH ANALYSES OF VARIANCE, ONE FACTOR COMPLETELY RANDOMIZED DESIGN

Item	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
20 - Available outside class				
Among classes	13	30.077	2.314	5.175*
Within classes	303	135.456	0.447	
22 - Encourages discussion				
Among classes	13	75.198	5.785	7.644*
Within classes	302	228.536	0.757	
24 - Relates subject to student's life				
Among classes	13	62.235	4.787	6.379*
Within classes	302	226.651	0.751	
26 - Organized, prepared for class				
Among classes	13	27.903	2.146	4.885*
Within classes	303	133.146	0.439	
28 - Well informed about subject				
Among classes	13	22.908	1.762	4.162*
Within classes	303	128.278	0.423	
30 - Informative, interesting lectures				
Among classes	13	27.442	2.111	4.490*
Within classes	302	141.986	0.470	
32 - Willing to change time on topics				
Among classes	13	34.787	2.676	3.767*
Within classes	301	213.829	0.710	
34 - Asks for suggestions				
Among classes	13	166.426	12.802	13.265*
Within classes	301	290.496	0.965	

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

36 - Enthusiastic				
Among classes	13	41.797	3.215	6.235*
Within classes	303	156.235	0.516	
38 - Calls students by name				
Among classes	13	328.898	25.300	25.966*
Within classes	301	293.274	0.974	
40 - Talks about student problems				
Among classes	13	77.011	5.924	5.474*
Within classes	301	325.733	1.082	
42 - Gives clear, easy to understand explanations				
Among classes	13	23.942	1.842	3.774*
Within classes	302	147.384	0.488	
44 - Gives fair tests				
Among classes	13	80.006	6.154	9.097*
Within classes	299	202.276	0.677	
46 - Tells what is expected in class				
Among classes	13	56.424	4.340	5.811*
Within classes	302	225.576	0.747	
48 - Allows disagreement in class				
Among classes	13	68.603	5.277	5.789*
Within classes	301	274.395	0.912	
50 - Listens to questions, opinions				
Among classes	13	37.159	2.858	3.764*
Within classes	300	227.812	0.759	
52 - Wants to be seen as a person				
Among classes	13	47.744	3.673	3.972*
Within classes	297	274.623	0.925	
54 - Varies classroom activities				
Among classes	13	65.200	5.015	6.975*
Within classes	297	213.559	0.719	

*$p < .001$

of implementation of behaviors are related to, but are not identical to, their perceptions of the importance of those behaviors.

The above conclusions suggest that the questionnaire developed in this study is sensitive to students' situational differences. Given the importance of those differences, such a situationally-sensitive instrument may provide the teacher with information not readily available from other student rating devices.

Implications

This study has been limited to the university level. However, the discovery that situational variables influence students' perceptions of appropriate teacher behaviors at that level also suggests that different situational variables might operate at different educational levels. To assess this, the researchers have modified the original questionnaire to suit it to the secondary level, and have begun to collect data in junior and senior high school classes.

A further implication of the study relates to the rhetorical design of the questionnaire. Since it is situationally-sensitive, it provides teachers with different feedback than other devices which assess generalized teacher behaviors assumed to operate in the same manner in all situations. The utility of the questionnaire as a feedback device is supported by the favorable comments of teachers who have used it.

A final implication concerns the use of the questionnaire as a research tool. It is a basic postulate of rhetorical theory that the effectiveness of a speaker's behavior cannot be assessed solely in terms of the execution of that behavior, but must also be considered in terms of how appropriate that behavior is to the needs and expectations of the audience. If one

accepts the classroom as a rhetorical situation, the questionnaire developed here seems a useful instrument for assessing teacher behavior. To the extent that a teacher's behaviors match his/her students' preferences of how often those behaviors should be implemented, and to the extent that students consider those behaviors important, a teacher's classroom behaviors can be said to be more or less adapted to the needs and expectations of his or her students. Such an assessment of a teacher's adaptation to his or her students might be the most important measure of teacher effectiveness in a particular classroom setting.

FOOTNOTES

[1]For a review of the literature in contemporary educational theory from a speech communication point of view, see Elizabeth Meagher Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education in Classroom Communication," Communication Education, 26 (January 1977), 1-12.

[2]Lynn, p. 1.

[3]One notable exception to this is Gerald Phillips, "Role Theory: Its Logical Conclusion," in Teacher Education as Actor Training, Occasional Papers of the Society of Professors of Education, A. Bagley, ed., No. 3 (Minneapolis, 1974), pp.63-72, and Gerald Phillips, David Butt, and Nancy Metzger, Communication in Education: A Rhetoric of Schooling and Learning (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974). While Phillips et al. are suggestive of a rhetorical theory of teaching, no research has been undertaken to demonstrate the utility of such a theory.

[4]For example, see The Appraisal of Teaching in Large Universities, Conference Chairman, W. J. McKeachie (Ann Arbor, 1959).

[5]Charles N. Wise, "Student Ratings of Teachers: A Perspective for Speech Communication," Western Speech, 37 (Summer 1973), 196-203.

[6]For examples from the field of education, see William R. Beck, "Pupils' Perceptions of Teacher Merit: A Factor Analysis of Five Postulated Dimensions," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (November 1967), 127-128; Ioannis Paraskevopoulos, "How Students Rate Their Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 62 (September 1968), 25-29; William D. Coates, Lloyd Swierenga, and Jack Wickert, "Student Perceptions of Teachers - A Factor Analytic Study," Journal of Educational Research, 65 (April 1972), 357-360. For an example

from the field of speech communication, see Betty J. Haslett, "The Influence of Student Knowledgeability on Student Ratings of Instruction," Communication Education, 26 (January 1977), 44-51.

[7]Gary Cronkhite and Jo Liska, "A Critique of Factor Analytic Approaches to the Study of Source Credibility," Communication Monographs, 43 (June 1976), 91-107.

[8]Earl E. McDowell and Carlene E. McDowell, "Creating Inductive Teacher Evaluation Instruments: Factor Analysis of Student-Generated Scales and Teacher Image Questionnaire," Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention in San Francisco, 1976.

[9]Warren S. Torgerson, Theory and Methods of Scaling (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), p. 46.

[10]Sanford Labovitz, "Some Observations on Measurement and Statistics," Social Forces, 46 (December 1967), 151-160.

[11]Barak Rosenshine, Teaching Behaviours and Student Achievement (Berks: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971), p. 21.

[12]Frederick K. Brown, Principles of Educational and Psychological Testing, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976), p. 127.

APPENDIX

General Instructions

Please record your answers on the separate answer sheet by blackening the appropriate circles. Please use a #2 pencil, not ink or colored pencil. Please erase any unintended marks.

So that you may remain anonymous, do not fill in your name or your student number. (Also, do not identify the course, the instructor, or the date.)

For the purposes of the research, would you please provide the following information in the indicated locations on the answer sheet?

Information	Location on Answer Sheet	Possible Responses
1. Your age	"SEC. NO."	00 to 99
2. Your college (or major)	Columns "A" & "B"	01 to 13
01 - Agriculture 02 - Arts and Architecture 03 - Business Administration 04 - Earth and Mineral Science 05 - Education 06 - Engineering 07 - Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 08 - Human Development 09 - Liberal Arts 10 - Science 11 - Interdisciplinary Program 12 - Division of Undergraduate Studies 13 - Other		
3. Your term standing	Columns "C" & "D"	01 to 15
4. Your grade point average	"SCORE"	0.00 to 4.00
5. Your sex	"TEST FORM"	A or B
A - Male B - Female		
6. Are you taking this course to fulfill a requirement of your major, your college, or the university?	"SPECIAL CODE"	0 or 1
0 - Yes 1 - No		

For each question on this page, please blacken the letter on your answer sheet that indicates your answer. Please consider what you think about this particular instructor in this particular course.

How important is it to you that your instructor:

		Totally Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Not Important At All
1.	Be available to meet with you outside of class?	A	B	C	D	E
2.	Encourages you to take part in class discussions?	A	B	C	D	E
3.	Relates the subject matter to your life?	A	B	C	D	E
4.	Be organized and well prepared for class?	A	B	C	D	E
5.	Be well informed about the subject he/she is teaching?	A	B	C	D	E
6.	Gives lectures which are informative and interesting to you?	A	B	C	D	E
7.	Be willing to change the amount of time he/she spends on topics to make sure that you understand them?	A	B	C	D	E
8.	Asks you for suggestions on how to improve the class?	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Be enthusiastic about teaching?	A	B	C	D	E
10.	Calls you by your name?	A	B	C	D	E
11.	Be willing to talk to you about special problems or interests that you might have?	A	B	C	D	E
12.	Gives explanations that are clear and easy for you to understand?	A	B	C	D	E
13.	Gives tests which are fair?	A	B	C	D	E
14.	Tells you clearly what is expected of you in the class?	A	B	C	D	E
15.	Permits you to disagree with him/her in class?	A	B	C	D	E
16.	Takes the time in class to listen to your questions and opinions?	A	B	C	D	E
17.	Wants you to see him/her as a person, not just as a teacher?	A	B	C	D	E
18.	Varies classroom activities to keep you interested in the class?	A	B	C	D	E

For each pair of statements on this page, please think about two different things. For the first statement, think about <u>how much you would like</u> your instructor to do what is described. Blacken the letter that indicates what you would like your instructor to do. For the second statement, think about how much your instructor <u>actually does</u> what is described. Blacken the letter that indicates what your instructor actually does.

		All of the Time	Most of the Time	Some of the Time	Little of the Time	None of the Time
19.	I would like my instructor to be available to meet with me outside of class.	A	B	C	D	E
20.	My instructor is available to meet with me outside of class.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	I would like my instructor to encourage me to take part in class discussions.	A	B	C	D	E
22.	My instructor does encourage me to take part in class discussions.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	I would like my instructor to relate the subject matter to my life.	A	B	C	D	E
24.	My instructor does relate the subject matter to my life.	A	B	C	D	E
25.	I would like my instructor to be organized and well prepared for class.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	My instructor is organized and well prepared for class.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	I would like my instructor to be well informed about the subject he/she is teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	My instructor is well informed about the subject he/she is teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	I would like my instructor to give lectures which are informative and interesting to me.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	My instructor does give lectures which are informative and interesting to me.	A	B	C	D	E
31.	I would like my instructor to be willing to change the amount of time he/she spends on topics to make sure that I understand them.	A	B	C	D	E
32.	My instructor is willing to change the amount of time he/she spends on topics to make sure that I understand them.	A	B	C	D	E
33.	I would like my instructor to ask me for suggestions on how to improve the course.	A	B	C	D	E
34.	My instructor does ask me for suggestions on how to improve the course.	A	B	C	D	E
35.	I would like my instructor to be enthusiastic about teaching.	A	B	C	D	E
36.	My instructor is enthusiastic about teaching.	A	B	C	D	E

		All of the Time	Most of the Time	Some of the Time	Little of the Time	None of the Time
37.	I would like my instructor to call me by my name.	A	B	C	D	E
38.	My instructor does call me by my name.	A	B	C	D	E
39.	I would like my instructor to be willing to talk to me about special problems or interests that I might have.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	My instructor is willing to talk to me about special problems or interests that I might have.	A	B	C	D	E
41.	I would like my instructor to give explanations that are clear and easy for me to understand.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	My instructor does give explanations that are clear and easy for me to understand.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	I would like my instructor to give tests which are fair.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	My instructor does give tests which are fair.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	I would like my instructor to tell me clearly what is expected of me in the class.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	My instructor does tell me clearly what is expected of me in the class.	A	B	C	D	E
47.	I would like my instructor to permit me to disagree with him/her in class.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	My instructor does permit me to disagree with him/her in class.	A	B	C	D	E
49.	I would like my instructor to take the time in class to listen to my questions and opinions.	A	B	C	D	E
50.	My instructor does take the time in class to listen to my questions and opinions.	A	B	C	D	E
51.	I would like my instructor to want me to see him/her as a person, not just as a teacher.	A	B	C	D	E
52.	My instructor does want me to see him/her as a person, not just as a teacher.	A	B	C	D	E
53.	I would like my instructor to vary classroom activities to keep me interested in the class.	A	B	C	D	E
54.	My instructor does vary classroom activities to keep me interested in the class.	A	B	C	D	E